

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action of Examiner LeChi Truong dated .

Claims 1 and 33 are in the case, neither as yet allowed.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-9, 13-30, and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over England (U.S. Patent 6,144,991) in view of JS (JavaScript and Frames, Part II - The famous Memory Game).

Claims 10, 11, 12, and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over England, JS, and further in view of Duursma et al (U.S. Patent 6,643,690 B2).

END920000174

12

S/N 09/815,316

Applicants have canceled claims 2-32 without prejudice, have amended claim 1, and have added new claim 33.

England at column 12 and 21 teaches a frame set. None of these frames, however, are initialized to include the code and variables required by all other frames of the frame set responsive to user interaction with the content frame.

The Examiner observes quite correctly that "England do not explicit teach the term 'storing functions and variables that are called by code in all frames.'" For this teaching, the Examiner refers to JS (see: Handling mouse clicks, ln 1/section : the Frames, 59-65.) The Examiner, further, refers to Duursma for teaching the use of frames in crating and processing a requisition.

Applicants' attorney has reviewed the JS reference, and is unable to identify in the materials provided the asserted teaching. Specifically, he has been unable to find "ln 1" of "Handling mouse clicks", nor "59-65" of "the Frames".

Even so, applicants have amended claim 1 and written new claim 33 so as to carefully recited the specific set of frames including a function frame, a data accumulation

END920000174

13

S/N 09/815,316

frame, a header frame, and a content frame frames and their interrelationships and operations for creating and submitting a requisition application during operation of a requisition and catalog system. This specific set of frames, and their claimed interrelationships and operations for creating and submitting a requisition is not taught by any of England, JS and/or Duursma.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1 and 33.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in

END920000174

14

S/N 09/815,316

condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

W. M. Sjostrom, et al.

By


Shelley M. Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 5 Apr 2005

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Patent Attorney
61 Glenmont Road
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972
Fax: (276) 238-1545

END920000174

15

S/N 09/815,316